

## BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Fyfe, Aileen and Eve, Martin Paul and Lawson, Stuart and Moore, Samuel and Neylon, Cameron (2019) Helping learned societies explore Plan S-compliant business models - A proposal. martineve.com ,

Downloaded from: <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/26049/>

*Usage Guidelines:*

Please refer to usage guidelines at <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html>  
contact [lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk](mailto:lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk).

or alternatively

## Helping learned societies explore Plan S-compliant business models – Response Grid

Section 1: Contact Information	
<p>Please provide contact details for the main point of contact for this piece of consultancy.</p> <p>If you are applying in partnership with another consultant, please use Section 1 to identify who the contracting party would be. When answering the other questions, please specify which party will be responsible for which tasks.</p>	
<b>Name of company:</b>	University of St Andrews
<b>Named contact:</b>	Aileen Fyfe
<b>Position:</b>	Professor of Modern History
<b>Address:</b>	School of History, St Katharine's Lodge, The Scores, St Andrews KY16 9BA
<b>email:</b>	
<b>Telephone</b>	
Section 2: Relevant experience and skills	
<p>Provide a summary of your skills and experience that demonstrate your organisation's ability to undertake the work outlined in the <i>Brief</i>. Please give examples of any similar pieces of work you have conducted.</p>	
<p>The team behind this application will be led and coordinated by Aileen Fyfe, University of St Andrews. It will involve members of the University's Digital Research Team (principally Stuart Lawson), and external collaborators (Cameron Neylon and Samuel Moore, with involvement from Martin Eve). The team configuration has been developed specifically for this project, but it builds upon previous collaborations. Between us, we bring a rich mix of research expertise and professional experience, as well as strong commitments both to open access and to the value of learned societies. Collectively, we have experience of providing publishing services; of publishing as academic authors, reviewers and editors; and of service to scholarly societies.</p> <p>We offer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expertise in the historical and contemporary analysis of the finances of academic publishing (including both learned societies, and open access)</li> <li>• Expert knowledge of changes in learned society publishing over the last 350 years</li> </ul>	

- Expertise, from multiple disciplinary perspectives, on the ways scholarly communities organise themselves
- Expertise in the analysis of open access policy
- Previous experience of consultancy work for organisations including Jisc, Open Knowledge, Knowledge Exchange, Crossref, the OPERAS Consortium, UCL Press, PASTEUR4OA and SPARC Europe
- 20 years of collective experience working in open access publishing (PLoS, Ubiquity, OLH)
- A shared commitment to supporting learned societies, grounded in our own membership of such societies
- A shared commitment to making scholarly research openly accessible (but with a variety of perspectives on how this might be done)

Aileen Fyfe's experience of leadership and collaboration includes leading academic research teams, undertaking inter-institutional collaborative research projects, and leading her departmental research strategy. Over the last five years, she has been an invited and valued participant at a variety of events by/for academic publishers, and has worked closely in an advisory capacity with the Royal Society's Publishing Division. The university's Digital Research Team adds a library-based perspective with significant experience in implementing open access policy, including Stuart Lawson's own expertise on the economics and policies of open access.

Relevant research outputs, reports and policy contributions by members of the team include:

Bilder, Lin, **Neylon** (2015), *Principles for Open Scholarly Infrastructures*

**Fyfe** (2015), 'Journals, learned societies and money: *Philosophical Transactions*, ca. 1750–1900' *Notes & Records* 69:3: <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsnr.2015.0032>

**Fyfe**, Curry, Coate, **Lawson**, Moxham and Rostvik (2017), *Untangling Academic Publishing: A history of the relationship between commercial interests, academic prestige and the circulation of research* <https://zenodo.org/record/546100>

Knowledge Exchange (2017), *Knowledge Exchange approach towards Open Scholarship*, edited **Neylon** <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.826643>

**Lawson**, Gray, and Mauri (2016), *Opening the black box of scholarly communication funding: A public data infrastructure for financial flows in academic publishing*, Open Library of Humanities, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.16995/olh.72>

**Lawson** (2018) *Report on offset agreements: evaluating current Jisc Collections deals. Year 3 – evaluating 2017 deals.* <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1473588>

**Lawson** (2018), *Open access policy in the UK*, PhD thesis, Birkbeck, University of London.

**Moore** (2017) 'A genealogy of open access: negotiations between openness and access to research' *Revue française des sciences de l'information et de la communication*, 11, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.4000/rfsic.3220>

**Neylon** (2017), *Sustaining Scholarly Infrastructures Through Collective Action: The Lessons Olson Can Teach Us*, KULA: knowledge creation, dissemination, and preservation studies, 1(1), p.3. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5334/kula.7>

### Section 3: Approach and Tasks

Provide an outline of the approach you would undertake for this work. Looking at the tasks identified in the *Brief*, indicate any which you think may be unnecessary. Equally, please identify any additional tasks (or different tasks and approaches) which would significantly enhance this work and help support learned societies transition to a financially sustainable, Plan S compliant, business model.

We see learned societies as communities of scholars, and thus as key spaces where the cultural norms and practices of the various scholarly fields are maintained. This means that helping societies make their publications openly accessible will be a means of facilitating culture change within their communities, in addition to creating new and sustainable OA outlets. Societies are the route to turning open access from an externally-imposed directive into a normal, desirable aspect of scholarly behaviour across all fields. We believe this is particularly important in those fields, such as the humanities and social sciences, where much research is done without external funding and is thus unaffected by funder-imposed policies. Our own background as scholars makes us uniquely placed to deliver a perspective rooted in community needs and not mere financial survival.

This consultancy offers a valuable opportunity to engage the UK learned society community in thinking about how open access might fit with particular (various) needs and missions. The groundwork will be to identify a range of sustainability models that might work for different types of societies. This will be followed by engagement with societies, to explore how those models would fit with the culture of the society, and what (if any) financial or cultural interventions would be needed. It is essential that this engagement involves the academic leadership of the societies in addition to those who direct the publications, for the members of these societies are the key stakeholders. The final report will present a taxonomy of possible models, an assessment of their strengths and weaknesses, indicators of which types of societies they would best suit, and the steps necessary for implementation. It will also include a self-assessment tool-kit to help society executive committees take this work forward.

#### ***Phase A: Identifying Sustainability Models [February, March, early April 2019]***

We will undertake a **short background study (Task 1)** that will:

- Survey the existing literature on learned society publishing, its finances and purposes; what is known about barriers to the OA transition;
- Identify UK societies currently doing some form of OA publishing; investigate the operation and progress of those activities, including the implications for costs, revenue and surplus/deficit; their compliance with PlanS; and, if possible from published commentary, the effects so far on the cultures of publishing in those communities.
- Identify and categorise the PlanS-compliant OA publishing services on offer from third-party providers for UK learned societies (either individually or collectively);
- Identify and categorise other possible models; whether they are being used outside the UK, and what the perceived barriers for UK implementation are.

This will be a combination of desk research (scholarly and grey literature, public annual reports etc.) and some interview-based research in collaboration with ALPSP (member survey data, identifying and liaising with societies). We will not undertake a new survey at this stage, but might do so in Phase B, once it is clearer what core issues need to be investigated. We will be careful to convey the rich diversity of UK learned societies, and to remain alert to the differences between societies of different sizes; that cater to different scholarly fields; and have differing relationships with third-party publishers.

We will prepare materials to stimulate and facilitate discussion in Phase B, particularly at the stakeholders' meeting(s). These will include an **options appraisal document (Task 2)**, articulating a range of sustainability options, with their pros and cons; and suggestions for the options that might best suit various types of societies. These options will include at least: APC-funded OA; consortia-funded OA; endowment-supported OA; green OA; direct support of publishing platforms as opposed to journals; and provision for overlay journals and similar approaches. We will also examine in outline the more general question of direct funder support (APCs, grants, direct journal funding) vs indirect funding through investment in systems and capacity for the research community (software consortia; funding of development; underwriting of OA transition e.g. guaranteeing some level of income for a specified period).

#### ***Phase B: Stakeholder Engagement [April, May, June 2019]***

We will undertake a variety of forms of engagement with the members and officers of UK learned societies. This will include showcasing successful examples of OA society publishing, as well as discussion of other possible models. This work will have the twin aims of helping us to understand which options seem more or less credible for different societies, and of stimulating serious and informed discussion within those societies.

In April, in collaboration with ALPSP, we will convene and run **one or more meetings of representatives from a range of learned societies (Task 3)**. We would like the 'engagement' to reach beyond the 'usual suspects' at publishing-focused events, and hope that societies can send two representatives, one with intimate knowledge of the organisation and financing of the publications (e.g. publishing director or editor); and the other with broader awareness of the strategic aims of the society (e.g. honorary secretary or member of the society's council). These meetings are not intended to simply present or validate our findings, but are part of our research/engagement work. To make this more effective, we would prefer to run two or three moderate-sized events (if funding permits) rather than one huge event.

For the meeting(s), we propose to take an ideation, or design-based, approach in which the goal is for participants to define the desired qualities of an end state to the current transition, and to identify a route towards this. This approach assists participants to 'own' the outcome and goals. We would also like to use the meeting(s) as an opportunity for interviews with focus groups, both with societies already pursuing OA publishing (to investigate the effects on the cultures of publishing in those scholarly fields), and those not currently pursuing OA (to investigate the perceived obstacles).

Following the meeting, we will undertake two forms of further engagement with individual societies in May and early June:

- **Finance-focused business planning (Task 4a):** we will identify learned societies who are ready and willing to have a detailed conversation with one of our team about which options might be viable for them, and how they could practically be implemented.

Although we would begin with two societies as requested, there is scope for involving further organisations.

- **Cultural change (Task 4b):** we would like to engage with selected societies (at least four) for whom the transition to OA seems particularly distant/impossible. For each society, one of our team would run a focus group or interview discussion with officers/members/staff of the society. This would not be as financially-focused as Task 4a, but would aim to help the society understand the various roles currently played by its publications, to explore the options available to them, and to identify the perceived obstacles. It will trial the materials that will be the basis for the self-assessment toolkit.

#### **Phase C: Final Report [July, August 2019]**

The final outputs will be:

- a **report (Task 5a)** on what we have learned from discussing options with learned societies during Phase B;
- a **self-assessment toolkit (Task 5b)**. The toolkit will be intended to help those societies who do not benefit from a one-on-one meeting with our facilitator, to have constructive, well-informed discussions with their members about the transition to PlanS open access. It will help them evaluate the current costs and benefits of their publications; to consider which of the possible OA models might work, and what the practical steps to implementation would be. A possible future extension would be to identify funding to support facilitated use of the toolkit with interested societies.

These outputs will be delivered by 31 August 2019. As a team of scholars, we may also be interested in publishing a research paper related to this work, later.

#### **Section 4: People**

Provide a short summary of the people who would be assigned to this project and their key skills.

**Aileen Fyfe** is Professor of Modern History at the University of St Andrews. She is a prize-winning historian of science and technology, who specialises in the study of scientific and academic publishing. Through her AHRC-funded project on the socio-economic history of learned journals (in partnership with The Royal Society), she has unrivalled expertise in the management, finances and editorial structures of learned society publishers from 1665 to the present day; substantial experience in communicating that knowledge to industry and learned society stakeholders (e.g. invited speaker at OASPA, ALPSP, AAUP, UniPressRedux); and she has a deep personal commitment to the important role that learned societies currently play in modern academia, particularly in the humanities. She is a former treasurer of one learned society, currently serves on the Committee on Publications for another society, and is editorial board member for a third society. *[Fyfe would have overall direction of the consultancy; would help organise and lead the stakeholders' meetings; and have final editorial control of the outputs.]*

**Stuart Lawson** is currently a research data officer at the University of St Andrews. Lawson's PhD research investigated the politics and economics of open access. They have research experience investigating open access from both theoretical and empirical perspectives, including a series of reports commissioned by Jisc investigating the economic impact of journal offset agreements for academic libraries. *[Lawson would lead on the background study and draft the options document during Phase A; and draft the final report.]*

**Samuel Moore** is a lecturer in publishing at the University of Derby. He has extensive experience researching open access publishing practices from a humanities perspective and has worked in open access publishing for Ubiquity Press and PLOS. He has consulted for a range of institutions including Open Knowledge, PASTEUR4OA and SPARC Europe. *[Moore would undertake any interviewing necessary in Phase A; lead on the facilitated discussions and focus groups in Phase B, including Task 4b; and draft the toolkit.]*

**Cameron Neylon** is Professor of Research Communications at the Centre for Culture and Technology, Curtin University; and Director of KU Research. His research, advisory and strategy work focuses on cultural change in the academy, its challenges and opportunities. He is an expert on financial models for publishing, the political economy of scholarly groups, and policy design in the service of community change. He has advised publishers, funders, infrastructure providers, and consortia on various aspects of scholarly communication. *[Neylon would provide input into all the written documents; and would help organise and lead the stakeholders' meetings in Phase B.]*

**Martin Paul Eve** is Professor of Literature, Technology and Publishing at Birkbeck, University of London. As the founder of the Open Library of Humanities, he has extensive experience working on alternative business models for open access. *[Eve would help organise the stakeholders' meetings in Phase B, and would undertake the finance-focused business-planning for Task 4a.]*

## Section 5: Costs

Provide a fixed cost (including VAT) for undertaking this piece of work.

Provide details as to how this figure was calculated - by showing:

1. Total number days allocated to this project
2. Day rates (indicating whether all staff working on this project are on the same rate)
3. Travel
4. Other costs

### Personnel Costs

	Number of days	Day rate	Cost
Aileen Fyfe (St Andrews)	16		
Stuart Lawson (St Andrews)	27.5		
Samuel Moore	25		
Cameron Neylon	9		
Martin Eve (Birkbeck)	8		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>85.5 days</b>		

### Travel

- Fyfe to London, (3 advisory group meetings)
- Eve travel for 2 business-planning sessions in unknown location
- Moore travel for 4 engagement sessions in unknown location

### Other costs

- 10 hours of audio transcription (for research/focus group interviews) from <http://www.uktranscription.com/>

<b>Section 6: Timescales</b>
Please comment on whether you could adhere to the timetable set out in the <i>Brief</i> . If you cannot meet the proposed timeline, please provide an alternative.
We propose a <b>final date of end-August 2019</b> , to allow the team to work asynchronously around the different summer holiday periods applicable in the regions in which we are based.
<b>Section 7: Contract for Services</b>
Please indicate if there is anything in the draft Contract for Services (Annex B) that you would not be able to agree to. This information is being requested up-front in lieu of the short timescales in contracting for this work.
Please refer to the Quotation Letter.
<b>Section 8: Conflict of interest</b>
Please state any conflict of interests Wellcome should be aware of.
Given Martin Paul Eve's role at Open Library of the Humanities, his involvement in this bid would be limited to the areas specified above.

Responses should be sent to Robert Kiley ([r.kiley@wellcome.ac.uk](mailto:r.kiley@wellcome.ac.uk)) by 09.00 on Monday 14<sup>th</sup> January 2019.